



National Institute of Justice

S o l i c i t a t i o n

Jeremy Travis, Director

May 1996

Solicitation for Proposals to Evaluate and Research Sentencing Reforms and Their Effects on Corrections

Solicitation for Proposals to Evaluate and Research Sentencing Reforms and Their Effects on Corrections

I. Introduction

Despite recent decreases in violent crime, violence remains a serious concern of the American public. On many measures, rates remain high. The number of violent offenses committed with a firearm has increased by 78 percent since 1974. Youth violence, as measured by homicides committed by people ages 15 to 19, continues at record levels, and public opinion now rates violence as the biggest problem facing public schools.

In response to concerns about public safety, Congress enacted the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (the Crime Act). This legislation advanced a multidimensional approach to violent crime, including changes in Federal penalties for crimes and incentive programs for State and local jurisdictions. Some of these funds have been allocated for expansion of law enforcement resources through community-oriented policing. Some resources have been devoted to the reduction of violence against women through coordinated efforts among police, prosecutors, and victim services organizations. Drug courts have received support to provide expanded alternative sentencing and coerced treatment for drug-abusing offenders.

Finally, under Title II, Subtitle A—Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth-in-Sentencing Incentive Grants—most State and local correctional systems will receive Federal funds in fiscal year 1996 to expand their capacity to incarcerate violent offenders with more certainty and to impose longer and more determinate sentences. The funds are administered by the Corrections Program Office of the Office of Justice Programs. The sentencing provisions and their effects on State and local corrections are the focus of this solicitation, developed in collaboration with the Corrections Program Office.

II. NIJ's National Evaluation Strategy

Under Section 20108(b)(3) of Title II, Subtitle A, a portion of appropriated funds will be set aside for “research and evaluation, including assessment of the effect on public safety and other effects of the expansion of correctional capacity and sentencing reforms implemented pursuant to this subtitle.” NIJ will award up to \$4 million for these purposes.

As with the other State and local funding initiatives supported by the Act, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has formulated a comprehensive evaluation strategy to assess and evaluate major issues. The Institute identified key research questions and policy needs through an extensive consultation process with professional organizations, key State and local policy makers in the sentencing function, and experienced researchers in sentencing policy and program evaluation.¹ The result of these discussions has been a multi-tiered research and evaluation program that tries to maximize the lessons learned from projects funded under the Act, and feed back the findings in a timely fashion to inform subsequent years of program funding.

The three-tiered strategy of National Evaluation, Topical Research and Evaluation, and Evaluation Partnerships enables NIJ to 1) compile concurrent information on the macro-level effects of the national sentencing initiative, 2) determine the results of State and local sentencing initiatives that have wide-ranging application in other jurisdictions, 3) and improve the evaluation capability of States and local jurisdictions by supporting the creation of partnerships between research organizations and operational agencies to conduct evaluations. Each of these elements is defined in a separate section of this solicitation. The Institute will support this program through a combination of Crime Act and core program funds.

Section 1: National Evaluation

National corrections expenditures under Title II of the Crime Act constitute a significant investment in crime control through incarceration. Federal funds authorized to States from 1996 to 2000 total more than \$10 billion.

In order to assess and understand the cumulative impacts of these investments in confinement capacity, NIJ is soliciting proposals for a single national evaluation of the primary sentencing initiatives in the Act: Truth In Sentencing and Violent Offender Incarceration. The national evaluation will capture the cumulative impacts of the initiatives and inform policy makers and the general public of the impact and effectiveness of the legislative strategies implemented. Policy questions include “How did States interpret and respond to the Federal legislation?” “How were their strategies implemented?” and “What public safety and other social outcomes can be attributed to the expenditures?”

Early efforts should be directed toward instituting a data collection and measurement framework that tracks changes in State sentencing policies to qualify for Federal funds, resultant institutional and community corrections actions, and changes in prosecutorial and

NIJ is trying to streamline its process to accommodate the volume of proposals anticipated under this and other Crime Act solicitations. Researchers can help in a significant way by sending NIJ a nonbinding letter of intent by July 5, 1996. The Institute will use these letters to forecast the numbers of peer panels it needs and to identify conflicts of interest among potential reviewers. There are three ways to send these “letters.” You can fill out the mailer on the last page of this solicitation. You can reach NIJ by Internet by sending an e-mail to “tellnij@ncjrs.aspensys.org” and identifying the solicitation and sections(s) that you expect to apply for. You can write a letter with the same information to: NIJ Solicitation for Sentencing and Corrections Research and Evaluation, 633 Indiana Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20531. Help us help you.

judicial policies. Later efforts should be devoted to refinements in the measurement strategy and to assessing such impacts as crime trends, demographics of correctional populations, crimes of conviction, and changes in institutional and community corrections practices; and to assessing the costs and benefits of these reforms.

NIJ intends to establish a small **sentencing resource group** comprising interest groups and associations representing State and local stakeholders in sentencing reform. This group will help shape the research direction of the national evaluation and review reports produced under this grant. The group may also be asked by NIJ to help the grantee gather points of information unique to their constituencies. The group will be supported and directed by NIJ with independent funds. Applicants are invited to suggest member organizations of this group and possible roles for it.

Issues raised here are only illustrative of the range of topics that could arise as a result of these reforms, and some may also be addressed through other research and evaluations supported under this solicitation. The national evaluation should provide a backdrop for other, more targeted, studies and evaluations.

Truth in sentencing—Critics of current sentencing practices have often observed that the large differences between time sentenced and time actually served for prison-bound convicts drives a conceptual wedge between public expectations of punishment and systems practice. They argue that public confidence in the criminal justice system would increase if times served more closely matched sentences, and that deterrence would increase because potential offenders would weigh the consequences of crime with greater certitude. Advocates of truth in sentencing believe that discounts of sentences should be constrained to limits necessary for providing incentives for good behavior while incarcerated.

Violent offender incarceration—The violent offender goals of the Act support State efforts to increase the likelihood that a convicted violent offender serves time in prison and to increase the amount of time served.

States are encouraged to undertake correctional expansion that includes prison construction, modified prisons such as boot camps, and freeing bed spaces for violent offenders through intermediate and other community-based sanctions for nonviolent offenders. State officials are to act in concert and consultation with county governments to ensure rational and coordinated sentencing and correctional policies at all levels, including in jails.

Specific issues that might be addressed in a national evaluation include:

- Factors influencing adoption of truth in sentencing. What funding did States expect to receive? What changes in statutes were needed to qualify for funds?
- Documenting implementation processes. How did States decide who goes to prison? What factors drove decisions on number, types, and capacities of facilities? Did States move toward increased privatization of prisons?
- Defining “violent offenders.” How did the States’ definition of “violent offender” affect the size and costs of confinement populations? Were there gender-specific interpretations of “violent offender”?
- Changes in time sentenced and served. Did changes in sentencing policy cause length of time sentenced to move down toward length of time actually served, or did length of time served move upward toward length of time sentenced? Are the lengths of time served longer in truth-in-sentencing States?
- Effects on plea bargaining and community corrections. How were pretrial processes changed? How was post-release supervision affected?
- Changes in the mix of offenders in prisons. How do security and programming policies change when the proportion of prisoners who are violent

offenders increases? Can we build work “careers” for long-term prisoners? Do prison health care costs increase as prisoners serve longer terms?

- Impacts on public safety. Are there demonstrable links between changes in risk and duration of imprisonment and violent crime rates? Was there evidence of deterrent effects?
- Examining criminal careers for long-sentenced offenders and for juveniles sentenced as adults to determine how much “aging out” occurs; any long-term social costs beyond release should be included.

Proposals for the national evaluation should address the first three years (FY 96-98) of this part of the Act as their primary scope (plus FY 95 changes made by some States anticipating Federal funding), but should present to reviewers their strategy for assessing impacts through FY 2000. NIJ expects to solicit new proposals for continuation of the national evaluation beyond FY 98. The national evaluation is expected to extend through the life of the Act, although the Institute may compete subsequent phases of the evaluation independently. **Technical sections (literature review, problem statement, methods, and management plan) of the proposals may not exceed 50 double-spaced pages.**

Award amount. NIJ anticipates a single award of up to \$600,000 for this evaluation.

Section 2: Topical Research and Evaluation

New public policy questions about sentencing and correctional programs arise every year. Recent concerns have included boot camps, waivers of juvenile offenders to adult custody, and “three strikes” legislation. Each of these topics merits research and evaluation to establish their efficacy, possible improvements, and ultimate contribution to State and local policy and practice. Many issues in sentencing and corrections, however, persist regardless of the

sentencing paradigm or correctional philosophy of a given jurisdiction. Questions of public safety, program effectiveness, costs, and fairness are of perennial interest, and State and local professionals are in continual quest for information on which policies work best for what populations.

In keeping with its mission of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of criminal justice systems, the National Institute of Justice is therefore soliciting research under the Act that will improve State and local operations as they strive to implement the Act's intent. The scope of research and evaluation of interest under this solicitation extends from prosecution to parole. **The essential criterion of eligibility for funding under the solicitation is that the research and evaluation results improve State and local sentencing policy and related correctional practices. Award decisions will be strongly influenced by determinations of policy relevance (in addition to technical merit), and applicants bear the responsibility of articulating to peer reviewers the contributions to policy of their proposed research.** NIJ's broad substantive areas of interest are described in the sections below.

Measuring sentencing impacts. Many State legislators are concerned that changes in sentencing policy such as "three strikes" or "truth in sentencing" will result in runaway costs that severely affect the State's ability to support other priorities. The Institute will sponsor studies that measure the various impacts of changes in sentencing policies both prospectively and retrospectively. These studies can be based on previous State experiences or evaluations of current initiatives. They should include public safety and costs among their considerations but should also, when possible, consider other, less traditional, aspects of sentencing. Several study suggestions are as follows:

- Macro-studies of deterrence and incapacitation resulting from changes in sentencing.
- Counting and measuring costs and benefits in traditional sentencing frameworks.

- Impacts of sentencing reforms on the growth of specific offender populations.
- Measuring and managing risk levels in community corrections populations.
- Comparing outcomes from State sentencing models: guidelines systems, determinate sentencing, etc.

The sentenced offender. A primary concern of sentencing is the prevention of future offending among convicted offenders. Many different sanctions and interventions are employed through sentencing and correctional practice to accomplish this objective. At one extreme is imprisonment. While it prevents crimes that an offender would have committed had he been free, it is expensive; moreover, advocates and critics disagree about its impact on an offender's propensities to commit crime after release. At the other extreme is unsupervised probation or suspended sentences. While inexpensive, these sanctions offer the least assurances that convicted offenders will desist from crime or even that the criminal justice system will be able to detect future offending.

Much of correctional research and evaluation over the past decade has sought to understand sentencing and supervisory options between these extremes. Professionals in these fields harbor a persistent belief that cost-effective alternatives to imprisonment and unsupervised probation exist and that it is possible to devise sanctions that punish offenders, safeguard the public, and minimize the correctional burden on taxpayers. Moreover, professional managers advocate weaving these sanctions into an integrated sentencing system that offers judges a greater opportunity to choose a sanction appropriate to the offender's circumstances. Understanding how these "intermediate" sanctions affect different offenders, what they are likely to achieve, and how to integrate them into a State's sentencing practices are central goals of this solicitation.

The topics listed below suggest the range of the Institute's interests in research that focuses on

individual offender outcomes in the context of sentencing reform.

- Differential impacts of sanctions on recidivism; other measures of success.
- New community corrections concepts and sanctions; e.g., restorative justice.
- Improving drug treatment interventions for offender populations.
- Role of programs in prisons—rehabilitation or in-prison work programs.
- Long-term impacts of imprisonment on job opportunities and earnings.

Unintended consequences of sentencing policy. The intended consequences of sentencing policy are to meet such goals as punishment, public safety, deterrence, and rehabilitation. Traditional studies of these goals emphasize potential crimes averted, public perceptions of justice and punitiveness, program costs and costs of alternative sanctions, offender recidivism, and an array of broader social costs. It is possible, however, that traditional methods have overlooked or ignored other relevant outcomes of sentencing processes. Gains targeted by programs and policies may have been achieved at the expense of other safety priorities or other domestic policy concerns. The Institute solicits research on unintended consequences that clearly defines the consequences under study and their links to specific sentencing policies. Additionally, research conducted under this heading should be objective in that it portrays unintended consequences as tradeoffs to be considered in sentencing policies rather than as necessary or unnecessary “evils” of sentencing practice. Examples of possible studies include these topics:

- Crowding property offenders out of prisons because of lengthy penalties for drug or violent offenders.

- Creating long-term cumulative health care and other financial obligations through “life without parole” types of sentencing.
- Removing the male presence from significant numbers of families and from certain communities, including minority families and neighborhoods.
- Diverting State and local expenditures from other domestic priorities.

Courts-related issues. Judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys simultaneously practice under a State’s sentencing policy and help to define it. The amalgam of laws, finances, and capacities that comprise a State’s policies are in fact sets of considerations that must be applied daily by all participants in every case. These considerations affect the justice processes of the courts and spill over to a broader array of resource issues for citizens in the State. The Institute solicits research on courts issues related to sentencing policy. The issues to be investigated should include how sentencing policies enacted at the Federal and State levels affect the practice of criminal justice law at local levels, or how local responses to changes in sentencing policy influence the effectiveness of those changes. Some specific illustrations of courts-related issues are as follows:

- Assessing impacts of mandatory sentences on local plea bargaining and courts backlogs.
- Evaluating the effects of alternative implementations of justice (guidelines, mandatory minimums, and restorative justice) on costs, sentence outcomes, and victim satisfaction.
- Defining equivalent sanctions: exchange tradeoffs among intermediate sanctions such as fines, split sentences, boot camps, etc.

- Describing how active judicial involvement in offender outcomes (e.g., drug courts and other specialized courts) affects working relationships among prosecutors, defense, judges, and participants in court work groups.

Correctional management issues. Virtually every sanction imposed by the courts sends a convicted offender into the correctional system. Whether the offender is sentenced to confinement in a prison or to some community-based punishment, he will come under professional supervision that will operationalize the sanctions imposed, assess the offender's needs, and develop a plan to reduce the risk of subsequent criminal acts. These correctional activities consume a substantial amount of public resources. It is therefore necessary to conduct research and evaluation that improves the return that taxpayers receive from corrections investments. These returns can be expressed in several ways, among them costs, crimes averted, reductions in drug abuse, and restorations to victims.

The Institute solicits research and evaluation that investigates ways to best meet the challenges of sentencing reforms and other changes in sentencing policy. Applicants should develop explicit connections between the research proposed and the sentencing issues raised by this solicitation. Possible topics are as follows:

- Effectiveness of prison treatment programs, including aftercare and job placement. This topic is a funding priority because of its specific funding emphasis in the Act.
- Effects of "certain" prison terms on institutional programming.
- Describing the growth, function, and performance of "supermax" prisons.
- Establishing correctional priorities: new relationships between the public and corrections professionals.

- Understanding parole effectiveness and the implications of abolishing parole.

Other research and evaluation topics. The topics mentioned under the headings above are only a fraction of the research and evaluations that the Institute encourages under this solicitation. They were offered to illustrate the kinds of questions to be considered rather than to define the entire scope of useful studies. In developing topics, applicants should assess and explain their likely contributions to understanding the effects of sentencing policies on the criminal justice system and on society at large.

Proposal preparation. Technical sections submitted under this section of the solicitation are restricted to 30 double-spaced pages. Extensive technical appendixes are discouraged, and peer reviewers are not required to read them.

Award amounts. NIJ anticipates supporting 10 to 15 grants totaling up to \$2 million under this section.

Section 3: Evaluation Partnerships

An essential part of NIJ's overall evaluation strategy is the development of improved evaluation capability within State and local criminal justice systems. While rigorous evaluations conducted on topics of interest in other jurisdictions offer valuable insights for practitioners in correctional agencies across the country, they frequently lack the context and immediate relevance of evaluations conducted by authorities on their own programs. Recognizing that most operational agencies neither have nor can afford substantial inhouse research and evaluation expertise, the National Institute of Justice encourages partnerships between these agencies and research institutions. The purpose of these partnerships is to stimulate collaborative efforts with the goal of developing lasting relationships.

The central objective of these partnerships is to explore how State sentencing policies and practices are best implemented within the contexts of State or local agencies. Both sentencing and corrections partnerships can be formed. A research organization may team with a sentencing commission to assess efforts to integrate intermediate sanctions within existing guidelines.

Judges may wish to develop and evaluate new specialized courts that administer probation or parole revocation processes. State prison officials may wish to experiment with new forms of programming for long-term offenders. Community-based corrections agencies might explore new ways to expand prison capacity for violent offenders through special security programs for higher-risk probationers. As in all elements of this solicitation, applicants must explain how their efforts will improve the understanding of the implementations or impacts of sentencing policies, both formal and informal.

The Institute encourages partnerships because it believes that criminal justice agencies should have available the expertise and capacity to experiment and evaluate their own efforts. Awards made under this section of the solicitation will be subjected to tests of programmatic and technical merit similar to those applied to proposals submitted under other sections. Because of the emphasis on partnerships imposed under this section, however, *equal weight in the funding decision will be given to the quality of the working relationship defined between the research organization and the operational agency and, if successful, the likelihood of continued collaboration after Federal funding ends.*

Proposals should first articulate the sentencing issue the agency faces. The partners should then explain their collaborative approach, including 1) the preliminary research strategy (i.e., how research would help resolve a problem or contribute to revised policies or practices); 2) the respective roles of agency personnel and research staff; and 3) the decision process for modifying either the research plan or the program. Either the research organization or the operational agency may submit the proposal, and co-application is encouraged. **Proposals submitted under this section**

are restricted to technical sections of 20 pages. In developing their budgets, partnerships should be aware that *NIJ research funds may not be used to support program operations*; they may, however, provide support for operations staff performing research functions.

Award amounts. NIJ anticipates supporting 15 to 20 grants totaling up to \$1.5 million under this section.

III. Application Requirements

This section presents general application information, recommendations to proposal writers, and requirements for grant recipients. The application form, SF-424, is included at the end of this document. Proposals not conforming to these application procedures will not be considered.

Award Period. In general, NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months. However, longer budget periods may be considered.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of **fully executed proposals** should be sent to:

Solicitation for Sentencing and Corrections
Research and Evaluation
National Institute of Justice
Room 880
633 Indiana Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals **must be received** at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on **Tuesday, July 30, 1996**. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

Contact. Applicants who have questions about this solicitation for proposals may contact the U. S. Department of Justice Response Center, by phone at 800-421-6770 (local number is 202-307-1480) and by fax at 202-616-9249. Tawana Waugh of the Response Center may be reached directly at 202-307-1310. The

Response Center also has materials related to the solicitation.

Certifications. Applicants should read and sign the certification form regarding lobbying; debarment, suspension, and other responsibility matters; and drug-free workplace requirement included in this solicitation. Signing this form commits the applicant to compliance with the certification requirements under 28 CFR Part 69, “New Restrictions on Lobbying,” and 28 CFR Part 67, “Government-Wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-Wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants).” The certification will be treated as a material representation of the fact upon which reliance will be placed by the U.S. Department of Justice in making awards.

Recommendations to Proposal Writers

Over the past 4 years, Institute staff have reviewed approximately 1,500 grant applications. On the basis of those reviews and inquiries from applicants, the Institute offers the following recommendations to help potential applicants present workable, understandable proposals. Many of these recommendations were adopted from materials provided to NIJ by the State Justice Institute, especially for applicants new to NIJ. Others reflect standard NIJ requirements.

The author(s) of the proposal should be clearly identified.

Proposals that are incorrectly collated, incomplete, or handwritten will be judged as submitted or, at NIJ’s discretion, will be returned without a deadline extension. No additions to the original submission are allowed. The Institute suggests that applicants make certain that they address the questions, issues, and requirements set forth below when preparing an application.

1. What is the subject or problem you wish to address? Describe the subject or problem and how it affects the criminal justice system and the public. Discuss how your approach will improve the situation or advance the state of the art of knowledge or state of

the science and explain why it is the most appropriate approach to take. Give appropriate citations to the research literature. The source of statistics or research findings cited to support a statement or position should be included in a reference list.

2. What do you want to do? Explain the goal(s) of the project in simple, straightforward terms. The goals should describe the intended consequences or expected overall effect of the proposed project, rather than the tasks or activities to be conducted. To the greatest extent possible, applicants should avoid a specialized vocabulary that is not readily understood by the general public. Technical jargon does not enhance an application.

3. How will you do it? Describe the methodology carefully so that what you propose to do and how you would do it is clear. All proposed tasks should be set forth so that a reviewer can see a logical progression of tasks and relate those tasks directly to the accomplishment of the project’s goal(s). When in doubt about whether to provide a more detailed explanation or to assume a particular level of knowledge or expertise on the part of the reviewers, err on the side of caution and provide the additional information. A description of project tasks also will help identify necessary budget items. All staff positions and project costs should relate directly to the tasks described. The Institute encourages applicants to attach letters of cooperation and support from agencies that will be involved in or directly affected by the proposed project.

4. What should you include in a grant application for a program evaluation? If a grant application is for a program evaluation, describe how the evaluation will determine whether the proposed program, training, procedure, service, or technology accomplished the objectives it was designed to meet. Applicants seeking support for a proposed evaluation should describe the criteria that will be used to evaluate the project’s effectiveness and identify program elements that will require further modification. The description in the application should include how the evaluation will be conducted, when it will occur during the project

period, who will conduct it, and what specific measures will be used. In most instances, the evaluation should be conducted by persons not connected with the implementation of the procedure, training, service, or technique, or the administration of the project.

5. How will others learn about your findings?

Include a plan to disseminate the results of the research, evaluation, technology, or demonstration beyond the jurisdictions and individuals directly affected by the project. The plan should identify the specific methods that will be used to inform the field about the project such as the publication of journal articles or the distribution of key materials. Expectations regarding products are discussed more fully in the following section, “Requirements for Award Recipients.” A statement that a report or research findings “will be made available to” the field is not sufficient.

The specific means of distribution or dissemination as well as the types of recipients should be identified. Reproduction and dissemination costs are allowable budget items. Applicants must concisely describe the interim and final products and address each product’s purpose, audience, and usefulness to the field. This discussion should identify the principal criminal justice constituency or type of agency for which each product is intended and describe how the constituent group or agency would be expected to use the product or report. Successful proposals will clearly identify the nature of the grant products that can reasonably be expected if the project is funded. In addition, a schedule of delivery dates of all products should be delineated.

6. What are the specific costs involved? The budget application should be presented clearly. Major budget categories such as personnel, benefits, travel, supplies, equipment, and indirect costs should be identified separately. The components of “Other” or “Miscellaneous” items should be specified in the application budget narrative and should not include set-asides for undefined contingencies.

7. How much detail should be included in the budget narrative? The budget narrative should list all planned expenditures and detail the salaries, materials, and cost assumptions used to estimate project costs. The narrative and cost estimates should be presented under the following standard budget categories: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contracts, other, and indirect costs. For multiyear projects, applicants must include the full amount of NIJ funding for the entire life of the project. This amount should be reflected in item 15g on Form 424 and in TOTAL PROJECT COSTS in Budget Detail Worksheet (OJP Form 7150/1). When appropriate, grant applications should include justification of consultants and a full explanation of daily rates for any consultants proposed. To avoid common shortcomings of application budget narratives, include the following information:

- Personnel estimates that accurately provide the amount of time to be spent by personnel involved with the project and the total associated costs, including current salaries for the designated personnel (e.g., Project Director, 50 percent of 1 year’s annual salary of \$50,000 = \$25,000). If salary costs are computed using an hourly or daily rate, the annual salary and number of hours or days in a work year should be shown.

- Estimates for supplies and expenses supported by a complete description of the supplies to be used, nature and extent of printing to be done, anticipated telephone charges, and other common expenditures, with the basis for computing the estimates included (e.g., 100 reports x 75 pages each x \$0.05/page = \$375.00). Supply and expense estimates offered simply as “based on experience” are not sufficient.

8. What travel regulations apply to the budget estimates? Transportation costs and per diem rates must comply with the policies of the applicant organization, and a copy of the applicant’s travel policy should be submitted as an appendix to the application. If the applicant does not have a travel policy established in writing, then travel rates must be consistent with those established by the Federal

Government. The budget narrative should state which regulations are in force for the project and should include the estimated fare, the number of persons traveling, the number of trips to be taken, and the length of stay. The estimated costs of travel, lodging, ground transportation, and other subsistence should be listed separately. When combined, the subtotals for these categories should equal the estimate listed on the budget form.

9. Which forms should be used? A copy of Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance, plus instructions, appears in the back of this document. Please follow the instructions carefully. In addition, complete the Budget Detail Worksheet (OJP Form 7150/1), OJP Form 4000/3 (Assurances), and OJP Form 4061/6 (certifications regarding lobbying; debarment, suspension, and other responsibility matters; and drug-free workplace requirements).

10. What technical materials are required to be included in the application?

- A one-page abstract of the full proposal, highlighting the project's purpose, methods, activities and, when known, the location(s) of field research.
- A program narrative, which is the technical portion of the proposal. It should include a clear, concise statement of the problem, goals, and objectives of the project and related questions to be explored. A discussion of the relationship of the proposed work to the existing literature is expected.
- A statement of the project's anticipated contribution to criminal justice policy and practice. It is important that applicants briefly cite those particular issues and concerns of present-day criminal justice policy that stimulate the proposed line of inquiry and suggest what their own investigation would contribute to current knowledge.
- A detailed statement of the proposed research or study design and analytical methodologies. The proposed data sources, data collection strategies, variables and issues to be examined, and procedures of

analysis to be employed should be delineated carefully and completely. When appropriate, experimental designs are encouraged because of their potential relevance to policymaking and the strength of the evidence they can produce.

- The organization and management plan to conduct the study. A list of major milestones of events, activities, and products and a timetable for completion that indicates the time commitments to individual project tasks should be included. All grant activities, including writing of the final report, should be completed within the duration of the award period.

- The applicant's curriculum vitae should summarize education, research experience, and bibliographic information related to the proposed work.

11. How may grant funds be used? Grant funds may be used to purchase or lease equipment essential to accomplishing the objectives of the project. The budget narrative must list such equipment and explain why the equipment is necessary. Funds may not be used for operating programs, writing texts or handbooks, training, etc.

12. To what extent may indirect costs be included in the budget estimates? It is the policy of the Institute that all costs should be budgeted directly; however, if an applicant has an indirect cost rate that has been approved by a Federal agency within the past 2 years, an indirect cost recovery estimate may be included in the budget. A copy of the approved rate agreement should be submitted as an appendix to the application. If an applicant does not have an approved rate agreement, the applicant should contact the Office of the Comptroller, Office of Justice Programs at (202) 307-0623, to obtain information about preparing an indirect cost rate proposal.

13. What, if any, matching funds are required? Units of State and local governments (not including publicly supported institutions of higher education) are encouraged to contribute a match (cash, noncash, or both) of requested funds. Other applicants also are encouraged to seek matching contributions from other

Federal agencies or private foundations to assist in meeting the costs of the project.

14. Should other funding sources be listed?

Applicants are expected to identify all other Federal, local, or private sources of support, including other NIJ programs, to which this or a closely related proposal has been or will be submitted. This information permits NIJ to consider the joint funding potential and limits the possibility of inadvertent duplicate funding.

Applicants may submit more than one proposal to NIJ, but the same proposal cannot be submitted in more than one program area.

15. What is the deadline? July 30, 1996.

16. Is there a page limit? For the National Evaluation proposals, the technical sections (literature review, problem statement, methods, and management plan) of the proposal may not exceed 50 double-spaced pages. For Topical Research and Evaluation proposals, the technical sections may not exceed 30 double-spaced pages. For the Evaluation Partnerships proposals, the technical sections may not exceed 20 pages. Font size must not be smaller than 12-point. These page limits do not include references, budget narrative, curriculum vitae, forms noted in item 9 above, or necessary appendixes. Proposals failing to conform to these page and font limitations will not be accepted.

17. What elements constitute the proposal? The following components, presented in the following order, is mandatory. Omission can result in rejection of the application:

1. SF-424 (with Assurances attached), followed by OJP Form 7150/1 (Budget Detail Worksheet), budget narrative, negotiated rate agreement, and certifications.
2. Names and affiliations of all key persons from applicant and subcontractor(s), advisors, consultants, and Advisory Board members. Include the name of the Principal Investigator, title, organizational affiliation (if any), department (if institution of higher education), address, phone, and fax.

3. Abstract.

4. Table of contents.

5. Project narrative.

6. References.

7. Résumés of key personnel.

18. What does the review process entail? After all applications for a competition are received, NIJ will convene a series of peer review panels of criminal justice professionals and researchers. NIJ will assign proposals to peer panels that it deems most appropriate. Panel members read each proposal and meet to assess the technical merits and policy relevance of the proposed research. Panel assessments of the proposals, together with assessments by NIJ staff, are submitted to the Director, who has sole and final authority over approval and awards. The review normally takes 60 to 90 days, depending on the number of applications received. Each applicant receives written comments from the peer review panel concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. These comments may include suggestions for how a revised or subsequent application to NIJ might be improved.

19. What are the criteria for an award? The essential question asked of each applicant is, "If this study were successful, how would criminal justice policies or operations be improved?" Four criteria are applied in the evaluation process:

- Impact of the proposed project.
- Feasibility of the approach to the issue, including technical merit and practical considerations.
- Originality of the approach, including creativity of the proposal and capability of the research staff.
- Economy of the approach. Applicants bear the responsibility of demonstrating to the panel that the proposed study addresses the critical issues of the

topic area and that the study findings could ultimately contribute to a practical application in law enforcement or criminal justice. Reviewers will assess applicants' awareness of related research or studies and their ability to direct the research or study toward answering questions of policy or improving the state of criminal justice operations.

Technical merit is judged by the likelihood that the study design will produce convincing findings. Reviewers take into account the logic and timing of the research or study plan, the validity and reliability of measures proposed, the appropriateness of statistical methods to be used, and each applicant's awareness of factors that might dilute the credibility of the findings. Impact is judged by the scope of the proposed approach and by the utility of the proposed products. Reviewers consider each applicant's understanding of the process of innovation in the targeted criminal justice agency or setting and knowledge of prior uses of criminal justice research by the proposed criminal justice constituency. Appropriateness of products in terms of proposed content and format is also considered.

Applicants' qualifications are evaluated both in terms of the depth of experience and the relevance of that experience to the proposed research or study. Costs are evaluated in terms of the reasonableness of each item and the utility of the project to the Institute's program.

20. Are there any other considerations in selecting applications for an award? Projects should have a national impact or have potential relevance to a number of jurisdictions. Because of the broad national mandate of the National Institute of Justice, projects that address the unique concerns of a single jurisdiction should be fully justified. Projects that intend to provide services in addition to performing research are eligible for support, but only for the resources necessary to conduct the research tasks outlined in the proposal.

The applicant's performance on previous or current NIJ grants will also be taken into consideration in making funding decisions.

21. Who is eligible to apply? NIJ awards grants to, or enters into cooperative agreements with, educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, individuals, and profitmaking organizations that are willing to waive their fees. Where appropriate, special eligibility criteria are indicated in the solicitation.

22. Does NIJ accept resubmission of proposals?

The Institute will accept resubmission of a previously submitted proposal. The applicant should indicate on Question 8, Form 424, that the application is a **revision**. The applicant should include this information in the abstract. Finally, the applicant should prepare a one-page response to the earlier panel review (to follow the abstract) including (1) the title, submission date, and NIJ-assigned application number of the previous proposal and (2) a brief summary of responses to the review and/or revisions to the proposal.

Requirements for Award Recipients

Required products. Each project is expected to generate tangible products of maximum benefit to criminal justice professionals, researchers, and policymakers. In particular, NIJ strongly encourages documents that provide information of practical utility to law enforcement officials; prosecutors; judges; corrections officers; victims services providers; and Federal, State, county, and local elected officials.

Products should include:

- A summary of approximately 2,500 words highlighting the findings of the research and the policy issues those findings will inform. The material should be written in a style that will be accessible to policy officials and practitioners and suitable for possible publication as an NIJ Research in Brief. An NIJ editorial style guide is sent to each project director at the time of the award.

- n A full technical report, including a discussion of the research question, review of the literature, description of project methodology, detailed review of project findings, and conclusions and policy recommendations.

- Clean copies of all automated data sets developed during the research and full documentation prepared in accordance with the instructions in the NIJ publication, *Depositing Data with the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice: A Handbook*.

- Brief project summaries for NIJ use in preparing annual reports to the President and the Congress.

As appropriate, additional products such as case studies and interim and final reports (e.g., articles, manuals, or training materials) may be specified in the proposal or negotiated at the time of the award.

Prohibition on supplanting funds. Federal funds must be used to supplement existing funds and not replace those funds which have been appropriated for the same purpose. Potential supplanting will be the subject of application review, as well as pre-award review, post-award monitoring, and audit. If there is a potential presence of supplanting, the applicant or grantee will be required to supply documentation demonstrating that the reduction in non-Federal resources occurred for reasons other than the receipt or expected receipt of Federal funds.

Public Release of Automated Data Sets

NIJ is committed to ensuring the public availability of research data and to this end established its Data Resources Program in 1984. All NIJ award recipients who collect data are required to submit a machine-readable copy of the data and appropriate documentation to NIJ prior to the conclusion of the project. The data and materials are reviewed for completeness. NIJ staff then create machine-readable data sets, prepare users' guides, and distribute data and documentation to other researchers in the field. A variety of formats are acceptable; however, the data and materials must conform with requirements detailed in *Depositing Data With the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice: A Handbook*. A copy of this handbook is sent to each project director at the time of the award. For further information about NIJ's Data Resources Program, contact Dr. James Trudeau at (202) 307-1355.

Standards of Performance by Recipients

NIJ expects individuals and institutions receiving its support to work diligently and professionally toward completing a high-quality research or study product. Besides this general expectation, the Institute imposes specific requirements to ensure that proper financial and administrative controls are applied to the project. Financial and general reporting requirements are detailed in *Financial Guide*, published in April 1996 by the Office of Justice Programs. This guideline manual is sent to recipient institutions with the award documents. Project directors and recipient financial administrators should pay particular attention to the regulations in this document.

Audit requirement. State and local governments are governed by the Single Audit Act of 1984 and OMB Circular A-128, "Audits of State and Local Governments." Nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education are governed by OMB Circular A-133, "Audits of Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Institutions." The type of audit required under these circulars is dependent upon the amount of Federal funds that can be audited during the recipient's fiscal year.

For example:

- If the organization receives \$100,000 or more per year in Federal funds, the organization shall have an organization-wide financial and compliance audit.

- If the organization receives between \$25,000 and \$100,000 a year in Federal funds, the organization may elect to have an organization-wide audit or program audit.

- If the organization receives less than \$25,000 a year in Federal funds, the organization shall be exempt from the audit requirement.

Commercial (for-profit) organizations shall have financial and compliance audits performed by qualified individuals who are independent from those who authorize the expenditure of Federal funds. This audit

must be performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards. The audit thresholds contained in OMB Circulars A-128 and A-133 apply.

Financial status reports. Financial status reports (SF 269A) are due quarterly on the 45th day following the end of each calendar quarter. A report must be submitted every quarter the award is active. The final report is due 120 days after the end date of the award. The Office of the Comptroller, Office of Justice Programs, will provide a copy of this form in the initial award package.

Conditions for suspension or termination of funding. The National Institute of Justice may suspend, in whole or in part, terminate funding for, or impose another sanction on a recipient for the following reasons:

- Failure to comply substantially with the requirements or statutory objectives of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended; the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988; program guidelines issued thereunder, or other provisions of Federal law;

- Failure to make satisfactory progress toward the goals or strategies set forth in this application;

- Failure to adhere to the requirements in the agreement, standard conditions, or special conditions;

- Proposing or implementing substantial plan changes to the extent that, if originally submitted, the application would not have been selected for funding;

- Failure to submit reports; or

- Filing a false certification in this application or other report or document.

Before imposing sanctions, the National Institute of Justice will provide reasonable notice to the recipient of its intent to impose sanctions and will attempt

informally to resolve the problem. Hearing and appeal procedures will follow those in U. S. Department of Justice regulations in 28 CFR part 18.

Program Monitoring

Award recipients and Principal Investigators assume certain responsibilities as part of their participation in government-sponsored research and evaluation. NIJ's monitoring activities are intended to help grantees meet these responsibilities. They are based on good communication and open dialogue, with collegiality and mutual respect. Some of the elements of this dialogue are:

- Communication with NIJ in the early stages of the grant, as the elements of the proposal's design and methodology are developed and operationalized.

- Timely communication with NIJ regarding any developments that might affect the project's compliance with the schedules, milestones, and products set forth in the proposal. (See statement on Timeliness, below.)

- Communication with other NIJ grantees conducting related research projects. An annual "cluster conference" should be anticipated and should be budgeted for by applicants at a cost of \$1,000 for each year of the grant.

- Providing NIJ on request with brief descriptions of the project in interim stages at such time as the Institute may need this information to meet its reporting requirements to Congress. NIJ will give as much advance notification of these requests as possible, but will expect a timely response from grantees when requests are made. NIJ is prepared to receive such communication through electronic media.

- Providing NIJ with copies of presentations made at conferences, meetings, and elsewhere based in whole or in part on the work of the project.

- Providing NIJ with prepublication copies of articles based on the project appearing in professional journals

or the media, either during the life of the grant or after.

■ Other reporting requirements (Progress Reports, Final Reports, and other grant products) are spelled out elsewhere in this section. Financial reporting requirements will be described in the grant award documents received by successful applicants.

Progress Reports

NIJ Program Managers should be kept informed of research progress. Written progress reports are required on a semi-annual basis and should inform the Program Manager of which tasks have been completed and whether significant delays or departures from the original workplan are expected. The first progress report should cover the period from the beginning date of the project through the end of the first **complete** quarter (quarters are January 1-March 31, April 1-June 30, July 1-September 30, and October 1-December 31). Subsequent progress reports should cover the next two quarters.

All progress reports are due 30 days following the end of the reporting period. For example, if a grant is awarded in May the first progress report would cover the rest of the current quarter (through June 30) and the first complete quarter (July 1-September 30) and would be due October 31; the second progress report would cover the next two quarters (October 1-December 31 and January 1-March 31) and would be due April 30.

NIJ Program Managers should be kept informed of research progress. The grantee shall submit programmatic reports to the Institute consisting of:

Timeliness

Grantees are expected to complete award products within the timeframes that have been agreed upon by NIJ and the grantee. The Institute recognizes that there are legitimate reasons for project extensions. However, NIJ does not consider the assumption of additional research projects that impinge upon previous time

commitments as legitimate reasons for delay. Projects with unreasonable delays can be terminated administratively. In this situation, any funds remaining are withdrawn. Future applications from either the project director or the recipient institution are subject to strict scrutiny and may be denied support based on past failure to meet minimum standards.

Publications

The Institute encourages grantees to prepare their work for NIJ publication. In cases where grantees disseminate their findings through a variety of media, such as professional journals, books, and conferences, copies of such publications should be sent to the Program Manager as they become available, even if they appear well after a project's expiration. NIJ imposes no restriction on such publications other than inclusion of the following acknowledgment and disclaimer:

This research was supported by grant number _____ from the National Institute of Justice. Points of view are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Data Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection

Research that examines individual traits and experiences plays a vital part in expanding our knowledge about criminal behavior. It is essential, however, that researchers protect subjects from needless risk of harm or embarrassment and proceed with their willing and informed cooperation. NIJ requires that investigators protect information identifiable to research participants. When information is safeguarded, it is protected by statute from being used in legal proceedings:

“[S]uch information and copies thereof shall be immune from legal process, and shall not, without the consent of the person furnishing such information, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or

other judicial, legislative, or administrative proceedings” (42 United States Code 3789g).

Applicants should file their plans to protect sensitive information as part of their proposal. Necessary safeguards are detailed in 28 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), ¶22. A short “how-to” guideline for developing a privacy and confidentiality plan can be obtained from NIJ program managers.

SL000141

In addition, the U.S. Department of Justice has adopted Human Subjects policies similar to those established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. If an Institutional Review Board is necessary for this project, a copy of the Board’s approval must be submitted to the National Institute of Justice prior to the initiation of data collection. Researchers are encouraged to review 28 CFR 46, ¶46.101 to determine their individual project requirements.

** As part of its program development, the Institute commissioned six papers by leading researchers and practitioners in the field. These papers, collectively titled “Sentencing and Corrections Focus Group Meetings,” are available on the Justice information Center’s World Wide Web site: <http://www.ncjrs.org>*

Application Forms

Previous Editions Not Usable

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SF 424

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required facesheet for preapplications and applications submitted for Federal assistance. It will be used by Federal agencies to obtain applicant certification that States which have established a review and comment procedure in response to Executive Order 12372 and have selected the program to be included in their process, have been given an opportunity to review the applicant's submission.

Item:	Entry:	Item:	Entry:
1.	Self-explanatory.	12.	List only the largest political entities affected (e.g., State, counties, cities).
2.	Date application submitted to Federal agency (or State if applicable) & applicant's control number (if applicable).	13.	Self-explanatory.
3.	State use only (if applicable).	14.	List the applicant's Congressional District and any District(s) affected by the program or project.
4.	If this application is to continue or revise an existing award, enter present Federal identifier number. If for a new project, leave blank.	15.	Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate <u>only</u> the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 15.
5.	Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of the applicant, and name and telephone number of the person to contact on matters related to this application.	16.	Applicants should contact the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Federal Executive Order 12372 to determine whether the application is subject to the State intergovernmental review process.
6.	Enter Employer Identification Number (EIN) as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.	17.	This question applies to the applicant organization, not the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes.
7.	Enter the appropriate letter in the space provided.	18.	To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. (Certain Federal agencies may require that this authorization be submitted as part of the application.)
8.	Check appropriate box and enter appropriate letter(s) in the space(s) provided: —“New” means a new assistance award. —“Continuation” means an extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date. —“Revision” means any change in the Federal Government's financial obligation or contingent liability from an existing obligation.		
9.	Name of Federal agency from which assistance is being requested with this application.		
10.	Use the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title of the program under which assistance is requested.		
11.	Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real property projects), attach a map showing project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project.		

Budget Detail Worksheet

A. Personnel - List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
---------------	-------------	------

TOTAL

B. Fringe Benefits - Fringe benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in budget category (A) and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
---------------	-------------	------

TOTAL

C. Travel - Itemize travel expenses of project personnel by purpose (e.g., staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and the unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known.

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
				TOTAL_____

D. Equipment - List non-expendable items that are to be purchased. Non-expendable equipment is tangible property having a useful life of more than two years and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. Expendable items should be included either in the “supplies” category or in the “Other” category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technical advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the “Contractual” category. Explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project. Attach a narrative describing the procurement method to be used.

Item	Computation	Cost
		TOTAL _____

E. Supplies - List items by type (office supplies, postage, training materials, copying paper, and expendable equipment items costing less than \$5,000, such as books, hand held tape recorders) and show the basis for computation. Generally, supplies include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project.

Supply Items	Computation	Cost
		TOTAL

F. Construction - As a rule, construction costs are not allowable. In some cases, minor repairs or renovations may be allowable. Check with the program office before budgeting funds in this category.

G. Consultants/Contracts

Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project. Consultant fees in excess of \$150 per day require additional justification.

Name of Consultant	Service Provided	Computation	Cost
--------------------	------------------	-------------	------

Subtotal_____

Consultant Expenses: List all expenses to be paid from the grant to the individual consultants in addition to their fees (i.e., travel, meals, lodging, etc.)

Item	Location	Computation	Cost
------	----------	-------------	------

Subtotal_____

Contracts: Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source contracts in excess of \$100,000.

Item	Cost
------	------

Subtotal_____

TOTAL_____

(H) Other Costs - List items (e.g., rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by major type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, or provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent.

[illegible]

(I) Indirect Costs - Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a Federally approved indirect cost rate. A copy of the rate approval, (a fully executed, negotiated agreement), must be attached. If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant's cognizant Federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories.

Description	Computation	Cost
		TOTAL

Budget Summary- When you have completed the budget worksheet, transfer the totals for each category to the spaces below. Compute the total direct costs and the total project costs. Indicate the amount of Federal funds requested and the amount of non-Federal funds that will support the project.

Budget Category	Amount
A. Personnel	_____
B. Fringe Benefits	_____
C. Travel	_____
D. Equipment	_____
E. Supplies	_____
F. Construction	_____
G. Consultants/Contracts	_____
H. Other	_____
Total Direct Costs	_____
I. Indirect Costs	
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	_____
Federal Request	_____
Non-Federal Amount	_____

INSTRUCTIONS

PROGRAM NARRATIVE

Prepare the program narrative statement in accordance with the following instructions for all new grant programs. Requests for continuation or refunding and changes on an approved project should respond to item 5b only. Requests for supplemental assistance should respond to question 5c only.

1. OBJECTIVES AND NEED FOR THIS ASSISTANCE.

Pinpoint any relevant physical, economic, social, financial, institutional, or other problems requiring a solution. Demonstrate the need for assistance and state the principal and subordinate objectives of the project. Supporting documentation or other testimonies from concerned interests other than the applicant may be used. Any relevant data based on planning studies should be included or footnoted.

2. RESULTS OR BENEFITS EXPECTED.

Identify results and benefits to be derived. For example, when applying for a grant to establish a neighborhood health center, provide a description of who will occupy the facility, how the facility will be used, and how the facility will benefit the general public.

3. APPROACH.

- a. Outline a plan of action pertaining to the scope and detail of how the proposed work will be accomplished for each grant program, function, or activity provided in the budget. Cite factors which might accelerate or decelerate the work and your reason for taking this approach as opposed to others. Describe any unusual features of the project such as design or technological innovations, reductions in cost or time, or extraordinary social and community involvement.
- b. Provide for each grant program, function, or activity quantitative monthly or quarterly projections of the accomplishments to be achieved in such terms as the number of jobs created, the number of people served, and the number of patients treated. When accomplishments cannot be quantified by activity or function, list item in chronological order to show the schedule of accomplishments and their target dates.

- c. Identify the kinds of data to be collected and maintained and discuss the criteria to be used to evaluate the results and successes of the project. Explain the methodology that will be used to determine if the needs identified and discussed are being met and if the results and benefits identified in item 2 are being achieved.
- d. List organizations, cooperators, consultants, or other key individuals who will work on the project along with a short description of the nature of their effort or contribution.

4. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION.

Give a precise location of the project or area to be served by the proposed project. Maps or other graphic aids may be attached.

5. IF APPLICABLE, PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

- a. For research or demonstration assistance requests, present a biographical sketch of the program director with the following information: name, address, phone number, background, and other qualifying experience for the project. Also, list the name, training, and background for other key personnel engaged in the project.
- b. Discuss accomplishments to date and list in chronological order a schedule of accomplishments, progress, or milestones anticipated with the new funding request. If there have been significant changes in the project objectives, location approach, or time delays, explain and justify. For other requests for changes or amendments, explain the reason for the change(s). If the scope or objectives have changed or an extension of time is necessary, explain the circumstances and justify. If the total budget items have changed more than the prescribed limits contained in the Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements - 28 CFR, part 66, Common Rule (or Attachment J to OMB Circular A-110, as applicable), explain and justify the change and its effect on the project.
- c. For supplemental assistance requests, explain the reason for the request and justify the need for additional funding.

ASSURANCES

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies compliance with all Federal statutes, regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, including OMB Circulars No. A-21, A-110, A-122, A-128, A-87; E.O. 12372 and Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements—28 CFR, Part 66, Common Rule, that govern the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this federally-assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.
2. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and federally-assisted programs.
3. It will comply with provisions of Federal law which limit certain political activities of employees of a State or local unit of government whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by Federal grants. (5 USC 1501, et seq.)
4. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act if applicable.
5. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or give the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.
6. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.
7. It will comply with all requirements imposed by the Federal Sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.
8. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed in the Environmental protection Agency's (EPA-list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.
9. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976. Section 102(a) requires, on and after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for use in any area that had been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate, subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.
10. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 USC 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 569a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties.
11. It will comply, and assure the compliance of all its subgrantees and contractors, with the applicable provisions of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, or the Victims of Crime Act, as appropriate; the provisions of the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants, M7100.1; and all other applicable Federal laws, orders, circulars, or regulations.
12. It will comply with the provisions of 28 CFR applicable to grants and cooperative agreements including Part 18, Administrative Review Procedure; Part 20, Criminal Justice Information Systems; Part 22, Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information; Part 23, Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies; Part 30, Intergovernmental Review of Department of Justice Programs and Activities; Part 42, Nondiscrimination/Equal Employment Opportunity Policies and Procedures; Part 61, Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act; Part 63, Floodplain Management and Wetland Protection Procedures; and Federal laws or regulations applicable to Federal Assistance Programs.
13. It will comply, and all its contractors will comply, with the nondiscrimination requirements of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, 42 USC 3789(d), or Victims of Crime Act (as appropriate); Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; Subtitle A, Title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) (1990); Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; Department of Justice Non-Discrimination Regulations, 28 CFR Part 42, Subparts C, D, E, and G; and Department of Justice regulations on disability discrimination, 28 CFR Part 35 and Part 39.
14. In the event a Federal or State court or Federal or State administrative agency makes a finding of discrimination after a due process hearing on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or disability against a recipient of funds, the recipient will forward a copy of the finding to the Office for Civil Rights, Office of Justice Programs.
15. It will provide an Equal Employment Opportunity Program if required to maintain one, where the application is for \$500,000 or more.
16. It will comply with the provisions of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (P.L. 97-348) dated October 19, 1982 (16 USC 3501 et seq.) which prohibits the expenditure of most new Federal funds within the units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

Signature

Date



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 28 CFR Part 69, "New Restrictions on Lobbying" and 28 CFR Part 67, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Justice determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 69, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000, as defined at 28 CFR Part 69, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all sub-recipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS (DIRECT RECIPIENT)

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67, Section 67.510—

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, sentenced to a denial of Federal benefits by a State or Federal court, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a

public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67 Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about—

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will—

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted—

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state, zip code)

Check ☐ if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

Section 67, 630 of the regulations provides that a grantee that is a State may elect to make one certification in each Federal fiscal year. A copy of which should be included with each application for Department of Justice funding. States and State agencies may elect to use OJP Form 4061/7.

Check ☐ if the State has elected to complete OJP Form 4061/7.

DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67; Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

1. Grantee Name and Address:

2. Application Number and/or Project Name

3. Grantee IRS/Vendor Number

4. Typed Name and Title of Authorized Representative

5. Signature

6. Date

Dear Program Manager:

I intend to apply for funds under this solicitation. I expect to apply under the following sections (check all that apply):

- ☐ I. National Evaluation
- ☐ II. Topical Research and Evaluation
- ☐ III. Evaluation Partnerships

I would like to be considered as a reviewer for sections other than the one(s) checked: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone _____

Fold and Tape

AFFIX
FIRST CLASS
STAMP

National Institute of Justice
Solicitation for Sentencing and Corrections
Research and Evaluation
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531

Fold and Tape

For more information on the National Institute of Justice, please contact:

National Criminal Justice Reference Service

P.O. Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000
800-851-3420
e-mail: askncjrs@ncjrs.aspensys.com

You can view or obtain an electronic version of this document from
the NCJRS Bulletin Board System (BBS)
or the NCJRS Justice Information Center World Wide Web site.

To access the BBS, direct dial through your computer modem:
301-738-8895 (modems should be set at 9600 baud and 8-N-1),
or Telnet to ncjrsbbs.aspensys.com or
Gopher to ncjrs.aspensys.com 71

To access the World Wide Web site, go to
<http://www.ncjrs.org>

If you have any questions, call or e-mail NCJRS.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

Washington, D.C. 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/NIJ
Permit No. G-91